4/13/71

Dear Bill,

Before he left, Tim and I had a long talk, right after the airing of the (heavily-edited) second Bandy show. I believe I then told him of several areas of coming certain embarrassment for the King family and close friends, if not the SCLC as an organization. This came to pass when Gerold Frank, who was with Huie, got hysterical after the taping (remember, the hottest was edited out, close to half of what was taped) and came rushing up to me. A young friend of mine who was in the audience with a tape recorded also rushed up, so unobtrusively I was not aware he had, and he did get the last fragment of what Frank said on tape. When I later explained to several of the fine young people who took me to a late dinner the significance of what Frank had blurted out, he found that part of the tape and played it back.

Tim suggested that I write Stoney Cooks and Andy Young, and I did, without response for either (Is Young still away?), hence I write you.

These two things where my recollection is sharp (and there may have been others that will come back when I hear the unedited tape) are:

Frank claims to have proof that the King family formally approved the deal. I said I understood that they had only said that like King, they all opposed capital punishment, which is far from the same thing (as I go into in FRAME-UP). He insisted he had proof. I am reluctant to believe this can be from the family, and if, from what he made abundantly clear his book will say, if he says this, they will be at least embarrassed.

He brags that he has the autopsy pictures. The two prosecutors now assigned to the case told me in February that the copies Canale has and displays (on publicly-owned equipment, and with a public employee, of his office, using it), are his personal property! Remembering this, I asked if he got them from Canale and he said he had not. Where could he have gotten such pictures? From public authority only, which is a very considerable transgression against the rights of the family (precedent: JFK case, but also, as I am sure Wachtel will tell you, well founded in law). Now I think it is past time for somebody to be asking why all this is being fed to a sycophant who, beginning with a $100,000 advance and certain major promotional effort, can be expected to say what the SCLC, its leaders, the family, all say is wrong? To perpetuate the official fiction. I will make no use of it, but I think they are making a serious mistake to stay away from me. Their hurt will be worse. I do keep secrets and I do seek to avoid hurt to the innocent, but who will keep Frank, facing a financial disaster, as is Doubleday, even Huie admitting it, from anything he can pull to preserve either his reputation of his financial stake?

Especially with my publisher having done nothing with the book and answering no inquiries as to why (and without even having paid the "advance"), others had better start worrying. There is going to have to be a strong reaction against what I have brought to light.

Hastily,

Harold Weisberg

No bccs